

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. The pending claims have been amended, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13-19, 21-23, 26, 27, 29, and 30 are pending. Applicants have not added new matter; support for the amendments are given in Figures 4 and 5 and in the specification at page 10-13. Claims 3, 5, 7-8, 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Statement of Substance of Interview

An interview was conducted with the Examiner on 19 February 2009 with Examiner Tan D Nguyen and Attorney Karuna Ojanen, Reg. No. 32484 and Attorney Rong Yang, Ltd. Recognition No. L0279 in attendance. Claim 1 was primarily discussed in terms of patentable subject matter. The Examiner stated that he did not know if the enterprise architecture model was more than a collection of data, and a collection of data was not patentable. This was discussed at some length. Ms. Yang asserted that the claimed invention was very different from Vellante '102 because Vellante '102 generated only a number or a business value. No agreement was reached.

A second interview was conducted on 24 February 2009 with Examiner Tan D Nguyen and Attorney Karuna Ojanen present. Applicants presented some proposed amendments which were more acceptable to the Examiner. Agreement was reached that the method claim 9 and its dependent claims contain statutory subject matter. No other matters were discussed.

The Rejection under 35 USC §103(a)

Applicants traverse the rejection of the claims as being obvious over Bowman-Amuah '773 in view of Vellante '102. The rejection relies on Bowman-Amuah '773 as the primary reference but admits that Bowman-Amuah '773 does not teach a linkage assessment tool and an impact assessment work product, allegedly provided by the teachings of Vellante '102. Applicants assert that neither Bowman-Amuah '773 nor Vellante '102 teach the claimed elements of determining how a change in one section component effects the relationships with others of the section components (claim 1), or

determining the changes within the business component resulting from changes in the IT component (claim 9), or evaluates the operational linkages between the components (claim 30). Because neither reference on its own teaches the claimed elements, their combination cannot do so.

Vallente '102 teaches a method and a system that quantifies a business value of implementing or changing an application in an information technology environment. Vallente '102 outputs a number or value of what implementation of the application would cost.

Applicants further traverse because Vallente '102 does not teach an integrated enterprise component having a business component with the section components as claimed integrated with an information technology component. Vallente '102 at most teaches a mathematical representation of an information technology component. Vallente '102 and Bowman-Amuah '773, separately or combined, do not teach determining how a change in business component effects the information technology component; at most Vallente '102 teaches that a change in an information technology component, an application, changes a coefficient and thus a net value output from a complex mathematical algorithm. Vallente '102, moreover, disregards any changes in the business component and assesses only changes of an application in the information technology environment.

Applicants thus request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection and allow the application. Should there be any remaining issues that could be easily resolved by telephone, the Examiner is invited to telephone Karuna Ojanen at 612.455.3836.



Dated: 26 February 2009

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: /Karuna Ojanen/
Karuna Ojanen
Reg. No. 32,484
KO/ad